

## Bond Project Oversight Report

October, 2009

*Name of Institution:* The University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
*Prepared by:* Jorge Quintal, Facilities Management  
*Date:* September 14, 2009

1. *Total amount of bond dollars allocated to this Campus?* \$167,697,749
2. *Please list the projects currently underway, the estimated cost, and the status of each of these projects?*
  - Science Instructional Building: Cost: \$38,742,544. Status: Final completion and acceptance was August 5, 2003. Project was within budget. **Final report submitted. Project closed out.**
  - Infrastructure Enhancement (Technology Expansion): Cost: \$9,497,073. Includes funding from sources other than Higher Education Bond funds. Status: Completed and within budget. **Final report submitted. Project closed out.**
  - Stone Classroom Renovation: Cost: \$4,074,666. Status: Phase 1 complete at a cost of \$199,800. Phase 2 was complete for occupancy fall 2005. Project was under budget and on schedule. **Final report submitted. Project closed out.**
  - McIver Chiller Plant Expansion and Improvements: Cost for Phases 1, 2, & 3: \$7,870,755. Status: Phases 1, 2 & 3 are complete. Project was completed under budget and ahead of schedule. **Final report submitted. Project closed out.**
  - Northeast Campus Infrastructure: Cost: \$7,328,218. Status: Project is complete. The University has been using this facility since March, 2005. **Final report submitted. Project closed out.**
  - The Hall for Humanities and Research Administration: Cost: \$16,705,884. Status: Project is complete. Project was accepted on April 11, 2006 ahead of schedule. This building is one half of the McIver replacement building. **Final report submitted. Project closed out.**
  - Studio Arts Center: Cost: \$18,079,192. Status: Project is complete. Project was accepted on June 1, 2006 and on schedule for fall classes. This building is one half of the McIver replacement building. **Final report submitted. Project closed out.**

- Heating Plant Expansion (Steam Plant): Cost: \$4,148,035. Status: Project completed on schedule and within budget. **Final report submitted. Project closed out.**
- Electrical Substation: Cost: \$3,641,126. Project is complete. Project was within budget. **Final report submitted. Project closed out.**
- Aycock Auditorium: Cost: \$20,329,243. This is a CM at Risk project. Status: Project was accepted by the State Construction Office on 3/26/08. **Final Report Submitted. Project closed out.**
- McNutt Classroom Renovation: Cost: \$5,914,512. Status: Project was accepted by the State Construction Office on August 1, 2007. Close out expected in September 2009.
- Brown Building: Cost: \$7,008,446. Status: Project was accepted by the State Construction Office on December 5, 2007. **Final Report Submitted. Project closed out.**
- Petty Building: Cost: \$15,077,031. This is a CM at Risk project. Project was accepted by the State Construction Office on January 4, 2008. Waiting for State Construction Office's approval of the Final Report and As-built documents.
- Alumni House: Cost: \$6,041,186. Status: Project was single prime. Project was accepted by SCO May 2008. **Final Report Submitted. Project closed out.**
- Forney Building: Est. cost: \$6,443,392. Status: Project is single-prime. Project was accepted by SCO December 2008. There is still some minor punch list work that needs to be completed before the building is complete.

3. *Are the projects adequately timed to reflect cash-flow requirements? If not, explain.*

At this time in the program all projects appear to be adequately timed. A detail schedule of reporting is on-line through Primavision P6e which is accurate for both schedule and projected cash flow. This program can be accessed anytime by UNC – General Administration.

4. *List the projects that are substantially above or below budget and explain why. ("Substantial" is defined as plus or minus 10%.)*

The Science Building, when bid, came in substantially under the budgeted amount. The design was complete when the bond dollars were available and the bidding climate was ideal for taking bids.

- The Northeast Infrastructure project came in slightly over budget but was value engineered and funds shifted from Science Building savings to award.
- The Hall for Humanities and Research Administration building was slightly over budget. A revised deep caisson foundation was determined to be needed after more soil borings were taken and the City of Greensboro required extensive street repairs to be made over the original estimate.
- The Studio Arts Center building bid was 19% over the designer's estimate. The designers used a third party estimator which produced an estimate in December, 2003 that showed the project only slightly (1-2%) over budget. There was a substantial increase in the cost of projects on the open bid market in the spring of 2004. We did pre-qualify contractors on this project.

All other projects have bid within their budgets ( +/- 10%).

5. *Overall, are the projects underway on this campus ahead, behind or on schedule?*

All projects have been accepted by the University.

6. *What type of construction methods are being used (Single Prime, Multi-Prime, Construction Manager, Construction Manager at Risk)? Which ones have proven to be most effective and efficient?*

The following construction practices are currently being used to carry out bond projects in construction:

• Science Instructional Building	Multi-Prime
• Technology Infrastructure Expansion	Multi-Prime
• McIver Chiller Plant Phase 1	Single-Prime
• McIver Chiller Plant Phase 2	Multi-Prime
• McIver Chiller Plant Phase 3	Single-Prime
• Northeast Campus Infrastructure	Single-Prime
• Electric Substation	Single-Prime
• Heating Plant Expansion	Single-Prime
• Hall for Humanities & Research Admin.	Single-Prime – Pre-Qualified
• Studio Arts Center	Single-Prime – Pre-Qualified
• Stone Building Renovation	Single-Prime
• Aycock Auditorium	CM at Risk
• Petty Renovation	CM at Risk
• McNutt Building Renovation	Single-Prime
• Brown Music Building Renovation	Single-Prime
• Alumni House Renovation	Single-Prime
• Forney Building Renovation	Single-Prime

We have bid both single and multi-prime on a number of our projects. Single-prime has proven to be most effective. We have been concerned with the bidding market and HUB participation and therefore chose CM at Risk for the last two larger projects.

*7. If this campus is using CM at Risk for any of its projects, please describe your overall experiences using this method?*

We used CM at Risk for Petty Building and Aycock Auditorium, because these two were the only ones left that were large enough to take advantage of that process. We were pleased with the interaction between contractor and designer in the pre-construction services phase. It helped to keep the project's scope within the budget. We were also pleased with the HUB participation on these two projects.

*8. Are the expenditures of the proceeds from the bonds issued under this act in compliance with the provisions of this act? Yes.*

*9. Are there projects that have had a change in scope from its original intent? If any of these projects require General Assembly approval, please list these projects and the change. None.*

*10. List projects currently underway that required additional funding, other than bond dollars. Aycock Auditorium, Alumni House and McNutt required additional funding.*

*11. What are the sources for these funds? Are all of these funds on hand? If not, please explain why.*

Sources for funding augmentation for each project are listed below.

- Aycock Auditorium has been augmented by UNCG University Development fund raising and other available university funds.
- Alumni House has been augmented by UNCG University Development fund raising and a federal HUD grant.
- McNutt has been augmented by non-bond funds that were scheduled for a renovation of a Networks Operation Center located in another building. During the design phase of McNutt it was determined the Network Operations Center should be moved to McNutt, and the renovation funding moved with the center.

*12. What is the current HUB participation rate at this campus (please break down for women, African-American and Other)? Please list and explain efforts to reach HUB goals.*

		<u>Bond &amp; Non-Bond</u>	<u>Bond Only</u>
HUB Participation:	Women	6.9 %	6.0 %
	African-American	3.1 %	2.6 %
	Other	<u>3.1 %</u>	<u>1.8 %</u>
	Total	13.1 %	10.4 %

Our current efforts to reach HUB goals include a Plan Room at Facilities Design and Construction where interested contractors can review construction documents for the preparation of their bid. We conduct pre-bid meetings with bidding contractors where we discuss the many possible ways HUB participation can be maximized. Since the HUB results for both Studio Arts Center, and Hall for Humanities and Research Administration were low, UNCG has taken a more proactive approach to HUB participation with the following adjustments to our program:

- The last two large projects in our program are using the CM at Risk mechanism for project management. This raised our HUB participation significantly.
- Designers are being asked to make design decisions that make it easier for a General Contractor to break projects into smaller subcontracts.
- It is being emphasized to contractors what our expectations are, and they are verbally encouraged to break large subcontracts into smaller parts.
- A HUB Outreach meeting was held in the fall of 2004 to help educate the HUB community on the upcoming opportunities for Bond and Non-Bond projects.
- UNCG co-hosted a HUB Academy with NC A&T to help educate contractors in this area during the summer of 2005. There were 16 training sessions and a graduation ceremony was held on August 31, 2005.
- UNCG hosted a table at the HUB reception during the State Construction Office Conference for the years 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009.
- UNCG held a HUB outreach meeting on March 15, 2006 for Brown, McNutt, Petty and Aycock Auditorium projects. This was well attended with over 100 people present.
- UNCG hired a consultant to help get the HUB numbers up on McNutt, Brown, Alumni House, Aycock Auditorium, Petty and Forney buildings.
- UNCG now has a full-time HUB Coordinator on staff.
- UNCG has hosted several HUB Outreach Programs this past year.
- UNCG co-hosted another HUB Academy with NC A&T in 2009 which graduated 28 people at the graduation ceremony on April 7, 2009.

13. *Please describe any innovative practices being used to complete the Bond Program.*

We are using three tools that provide positive results in our construction program:

- As presented at the August, 2002 Bond Oversight Meeting, UNCG used a web-based construction management tool on the Science Building to effect quick communication between the architect, contractor and owner. We also used it for the Hall for Humanities and Research Administration building.
- We continue to use a third party scheduling consultant that is responsible to the Owner for accurate CPM schedules, and the schedules are updated every two weeks for time critical projects.

- The University sponsors a Quality Craftsmanship Award program that basically awards an individual or a team of individuals that have exhibited the highest quality work, cooperation and coordination on each project every month. Recipients of the award get a certificate, letter of appreciation sent to the home office and a hardhat sticker. This has been a very successful peer recognition incentive program for awarding outstanding performance on construction sites.

14. *What are the major challenges facing this University in completing the bond projects?*

Completing punch list on Forney and close-out documentation.

State Construction Office's backlog in approving Final Report and As-built documents for Petty Building.

15. *If this challenge was listed previously, what has been done since the last meeting/survey to remedy the situation?*

N/A

16. *Please list projects that are scheduled to start within the next quarter.*

Construction: None

17. *Additional Comments/Concerns:* None.